

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of April 30, 2009 and that claims 1-15 are allowed. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection.

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Kori et al. Applicants have amended the claim to include inherent antecedent basis. In the “Response to Arguments” section of the final action, the Examiner believes that this claim is directed to Applicants’ FIG. 7. However, Applicants respectfully submit that this is not the case. Instead, the claim is directed to subject matter described, for example, in col. 3, lns. 15-29 and elsewhere in the Specification. For example, received data may include embedded content protection coding signifying a first level of content protection such as one that allows for still frame copying, but this protection coding is not applied to the content. Instead, independent of such content protection coding that is in the received data, the processing system imposes a different level of content protection on the received data. The system restricts access to the received data based on the second level of content protection.

Kori teaches a different approach. Instead, Kori does not override or independently apply a second level of protection independent of that which was indicated in the received data, unlike Applicants’ claimed operations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claim is in condition for allowance.

Claims 16-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kori et al. in view of Official Notice Taken (supporting reference provided US 4,593,384). Applicants thank the Examiner for the comments in the “Response to Arguments” section of the

final action. The arguments state that FIG. 2B of Kori, namely bit 7-8, are taught in Kori to be replaced with code "11" wherein the data is copied in Kori. However, Applicants claim a different approach. The stored video data does not include any copy protection data unlike Kori which includes a modified code as stated in the office action. Accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to claim 15, Applicants note that the Examiner stated during the telephone conference that paragraph 2 on page 9 was duplicated in error from a previous response. Accordingly, Applicants will not address the statement.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (312) 609-7599.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2009

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005